

Appln. No. 10/006,868

Amendment dated February 17, 2004

Reply to Office Action mailed November 18, 2003

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is courteously requested in order to place all claims in this application in allowable condition and/or to place the non-allowed claims in better condition for consideration on appeal.

Claim 7 remains in this application. Claims 1 through 6 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

**Paragraphs 2 through 5 of the Office Action**

Claims 1 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattson in view of Logson.

Claims 4 through 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattson in view of Peterson.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattson in view of Logson and Peterson and further in view of Hull et al.

Claims 1 and 3 through 6 have been cancelled.

Claim 7, particularly as amended, requires "a first handgrip being attached to and extending around said elongated body, said first handgrip being positioned generally between said second end of said elongated body and said flange, said first handgrip having a plurality of finger receiving indentations, *said first handgrip having a first annular flange extending radially outward, said first annular flange of said first handgrip being positioned at said first end of said elongated body*" and "a second handgrip being attached to and extending around said elongated body, said second handgrip being positioned adjacent to and extending over said first end of said elongated body, said second handgrip having a diameter greater than diameter of said aperture in said tubular member, said second handgrip

Appln. No. 10/006,868

Amendment dated February 17, 2004

Reply to Office Action mailed November 18, 2003

having a plurality of finger receiving indentations, *said second handgrip having a second annular flange extending radially outward, said second annular flange of said second handgrip being positioned adjacent to said annular flange of said elongated body*".

It is submitted that the cited references, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Mattson, Logsdon, Peterson, and Hull et al. set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claim 7. Each of the cited patents either lacks the first and second annular flanges of the respective first and second handgrips, or shows flange structures that are positioned in opposite locations to the position requirements of the claim 7, particularly as amended, and therefore could only lead one of ordinary skill in the art away from the requirements of claim 7.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 7 is therefore respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KAARDAL & ASSOCIATES, PC

By 

Date: 2-18-04

Ivar M. Kaardal (Reg. No. 29,812)

KAARDAL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250

Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5802

(605)336-9446 FAX (605)336-1931

e-mail patent@kaardal.com